

the expert for the prosecution, being asked to describe epilepsy, described the *grand mal* only, and reference to the *petit mal* had to be drawn out of him by rigid cross-examination. In an Illinois case one expert for the prosecution acted in just the same way ; and another, on being asked if an epileptic could remain in contact with other men for months without being suspected, replied that he could not ; on cross-examination it was found that he meant, although he did not so state, only that *grand mal* could not escape detection under such circumstances. Now, whether the diagnosis of these experts was correct or not, such statements cannot be regarded other than as the utterance of half-truths, and for these there is no excuse. Experts may honestly differ as to diagnoses, but such difference does not justify the suppression of well-established facts in science. Here is the great source of distrust of expert testimony, and one of the reasons for its contradictory nature. For such testimony there is, under the existing state of things, one remedy—the scientific physician should assist the lawyer to cross-examine the opposing expert on the fundamental principles of science. Such a course will not be objected to by any honest expert, and is doubly called for in the case of dishonest experts. It will make cross-examination an excellent means of eliciting truth. No respectable expert will aid an attorney in badgering another ; but cross-examination as to knowledge of the principles of science is a very different thing.

---

#### RETROGRADE PROGRESS.

It is stated that it has been determined to strike psychiatry from the list of subjects required in the German State's examination. From this it is evident that the so-called "practical" spirit is beginning to dominate the German mind. The present system of examination has not imbued the average German physician with an enormous knowledge of psychiatry, since a German railroad physician testified in a recent case that a patient who presented all the physical and some of the mental symptoms of parietic dementia was, although but forty-three years old, suffering

only from the effects of senility. If such blunders are possible under a State examination which requires a knowledge of psychiatry, how much worse will things become when such knowledge is no longer required as a preliminary to a license to practise? No doubt in time, if this "practical" spirit spreads, the "politician expert" will make his appearance in Germany, and he will be of even a meaner type than the American, for public opinion will be without effect on one made an expert for family reasons. This procedure of the German authorities is a decidedly retrograde movement, which cannot but have baneful results, and it seriously reflects on the German alienists that such a procedure should have been proposed.

---

#### NATIVISM IN SCIENCE.

It is to be regretted that there should creep into German scientific literature a nativistic tone which far exceeds any thing of the same kind with which Germans are so fond of charging the French. This nativistic tone is to be noticed especially in the criticisms on American contributions to medical science. In a report on Guiteau's brain, the editor of this journal called attention to certain artefacts. Dr. Pick, adopting the patronizing German nativistic tone, declared that such artefacts were long known to the Germans. It is a fact, easily demonstrated by a reference to the literature, that an American observer in this journal first called attention to the influence of alcohol in producing these artefacts, and it can also be shown that German authors, notably Schüle, for years after the appearance of this American contribution, were delineating and describing these alcoholic artefacts as pathological lesions, without producing a single deprecatory comment from their German alienistic confrères. It certainly is not a healthy sign, from a scientific point of view, to find this nativism so prominent in German medical literature. Even if the case were as stated by Pick, that is no reason for making the question a national one. Certain recent cases reported by Guntz show that there are German physicians as venal and incapable of giving true expert